



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/642,632	08/18/2000	Bertrand Serlet	004860.P2440	8235

7590 02/25/2004

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/642,632

Applicant(s)

SERLET ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin R Bruckart

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-30 and 32-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-30 and 32-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-6, 8-30, 32-44 are pending in this Office Action.

Claims 7 and 31 have been canceled.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed in the amendment filed January 13, 2004, Paper No. 3, have been fully considered but they are persuasive to perform an addition search. The reasons are set forth below.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on paper 4 has been considered.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited.

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Page 2, lines 6, 10 and 27.

Page 3, lines 8, 9 and 10.

Appropriate correction is required. In order to prevent executable code, applicant should rephrase the intended links in the form of "ietf.org" or "ietf dot org." Taking off the www before the address will overcome this.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5; 8-30, 32-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by International Publication Number WO 97/46956 by RAO et al (Applicant IDS).

Regarding claim 1, (Currently Amended) a system comprising:

plurality of web servers (RAO: page 6, line 8; Figure 1, tag 19, remote server) running the distributed authoring and versioning (WebDAV) (RAO: page 6, lines 5-8; manage internet files) enabled hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) (RAO: page 8, lines 11-12; protocol; page 13, table 1; http:// ...) coupled to the internet (RAO: page 6, lines 5-7; internet files); and

plurality of personal computers coupled to the internet (RAO: page 6, line 6, users; Figure 1, tag 10), each personal computer comprising an operating system extension (RAO: page

6, lines 8-13; logical layer between operating system and applications) that forwards file system requests (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) involving file systems stored on one of the plurality of web servers (RAO: page 6, line 8; Figure 1, tag 19, remote server) to a network access application program (RAO: page 4, lines 20 – page 5, line 5; shared library) on the personal computer that sends the file system requests as at least one WebDAV or HTTP request to an appropriate web server (RAO: page 6, line 8; Figure 1, tag 19, remote server),

wherein the file system requests (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) are received by a file system of the operating system (RAO: page 6, line 5; Internet File System) communicatively coupled to the operating system extension (RAO: page 6, lines 8-11; logical layer) as ordinary file system requests (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) from an application (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; logical layer between os and applications) that is not aware of WebDAV or HTTP protocol (RAO: page 6, lines 7; transparently).

Regarding claim 2, (Original) the system of Claim 1 wherein the network access application program (RAO: page 4, lines 20 – page 5, line 5; shared library) processes a plurality of responses to the file system requests received as WebDAV or HTTP packets and passes the responses to the operating system extension which forwards information from the responses (RAO: page 5, line 2-7; shared library; selects access protocol).

Regarding claim 3, (Original) the system of Claim 2 wherein the file system requests involving file systems stored on one of the plurality of web servers originate from an operating system client (RAO: page 6, lines 5-13;), and the information from the responses is forwarded to the operating system client (RAO: page. 5, lines 5-6; issues the call to the OS when retrieves the file).

Regarding claim 4, (Original) the system of Claim 3 wherein the operating system client is any of a plurality of user accessible application programs (RAO: page 6, lines 5-13; applications).

Regarding claim 6, (Currently Amended) a method comprising:

receiving a file system request (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) involving a remote file system

extension (RAO: page 6, lines 5-8; internet file system), the operating system extension receiving the file system request as an ordinary file system request (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) from an application unaware (RAO: page 6, lines 7; transparently) of a hypertext transfer protocol or distributed authoring and versioning (HTTP/WebDAV) protocol (RAO: page 8, lines 11-12; protocol; page 13, table 1; http://...),

creating an HTTP/WebDAV formatted request in response to the file system request (RAO: page 8, lines 4-7; 11-13);

forwarding the HTTP/WebDAV formatted request to an appropriate WebDAV enabled HTTP server (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; connects to the remote server);

receiving a response from the WebDAV enabled HTTP server (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; obtains the specified file); and

transferring an information contained in the response to the operating system extension (RAO: page 9, lines 10-11; storing the file in cache of the operating system kernel), wherein the information is presented as an ordinary file system response to the HTTP/WebDAV unaware application (RAO: page 6, lines 7; transparently).

Regarding claim 7. (Canceled)

Regarding claim 8, (Original) the method of Claim 6 wherein receiving a file system request comprises:

obtaining at least a uniform resource identifier (URI) and a request type (RAO: page 11, lines 17-20; page 13, Table 1; page 13, lines 16-21; open, close).

Regarding claim 9, (Original) the method of Claim 8 wherein creating comprises:

selecting an appropriate WebDAV/HTTP method responsive to the request type (RAO: page 8, lines 11-13; appropriate access protocol).

Regarding claim 10, (Original) the method of Claim 6 further comprising:

extracting an information from the response (RAO: page 17, lines 20- page 18, line 7; Figure 5).

Regarding claim 11, (Original) the method of Claim 10 wherein extracting comprises:

converting a WebDAV/HTTP status code to a corresponding local operating system error code (RAO: page 16, lines 20- page 17, line 7; Figure 5; codes illustrated as 0, -1 to indicate validity of resource).

Regarding claim 12, (Original) the method of Claim 10 further comprising:

creating a local cache file to store at least the information (RAO: page 8, lines 18-19).

Regarding claim 13, (Original) the method of Claim 12 wherein transferring comprises:

passing a file handle to the local cache file or at least a portion of the information (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; specified file; page 13, table 1, IFS Pathname).

Regarding claim 14, (Original) the method of Claim 10 further comprising:

updating a local cache file responsive to the information (RAO: page 8, lines 18-19).

Regarding claim 15, (Currently Amended) a method comprising:

receiving, at an operating system extension (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; logical layer between operating system and applications), a file system request (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) from an application program (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; logical layer between os and applications) via an application program interface (API) (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; system call interface), the application program being unaware of a hypertext transfer protocol or distributed authoring and versioning (HTTP/WebDAV) protocol (RAO: page 6, lines 7; transparently);

if the file system request involves a remote file system (RAO: page 6, line 5; internet file system), forwarding the file system request (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) to a network access application program (NAAP) communicatively coupled to the operating system extension (RAO: page 4, lines 20 – page 5, line 5; shared library), the NAAP creating an HTTP/WebDAV formatted request in response to the file system request (RAO: page 8, lines 4-7; 11-13);

forwarding the HTTP/WebDAV formatted request to an appropriate WebDAV enabled HTTP server over the Internet (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; connects to the remote server);

receiving a response from the WebDAV enabled HTTP server in WebDAV or HTTP format such that the NAAP creates a reformatted response (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; obtains the specified file); and

transferring the reformatted response to the application program via the API as an ordinary file system response (RAO: page 9, lines 10-11; storing the file in cache of the operating system kernel).

Regarding claim 16, (Original) the method of Claim 15 wherein receiving a file system request comprises:

obtaining at least a uniform resource identifier (URI) and a request type (RAO: page 11, lines 17-20; page 13, Table 1; page 13, lines 16-21; open, close).

Regarding claim 17, (Original) the method of Claim 15 wherein receiving a response further comprises: creating a local cache file to store an information extracted from the response (RAO: page 8, lines 18-19).

Regarding claim 18, (Original) the method of Claim 17 wherein transferring comprises:

passing a file handle to the local cache file or at least a portion of the information (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; specified file; page 13, table 1, IFS Pathname).

Regarding claim 19, (Original) the method of Claim 15 further comprising:

updating a local cache file responsive to an information extracted from the response (RAO: page 8, lines 18-19).

Regarding claim 20, (Original) the method of Claim 15 further comprising:

if the file system request involves a locally cached remote file system (RAO: page 18, lines 1-7), obtaining information responsive to the file system request from a local cache file (RAO: page 18, lines 8-11; page 17, lines 2-7).

Regarding claim 21, (Original) the method of Claim 20 wherein receiving a file system request

comprises: extracting a file handle to the locally cached remote file system from the file system request (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; specified file; page 13, table 1, IFS Pathname

Regarding claim 22, (Currently Amended) the method of Claim 20 wherein forwarding the request to the NAAP, forwarding the HTTP/WebDAV formatted request, and

receiving a response are bypassed when the file system request involves the locally cached remote file system (RAO: Figure 5).

Regarding claim 23, (Currently Amended) a machine readable medium having stored thereon instructions which when executed by a processor (RAO: Figure 1, computer) cause the machine to perform operations comprising:

receiving, at an operating system extension (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; logical layer between operating system and applications), a file system request (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) from an application program (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; logical layer between os and applications) via an application program interface (API) (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; system call interface), the application being unaware of a hypertext transfer protocol or distributed authoring and versioning protocol (HTTP/WebDAV);

if the file system request involves a remote file system (RAO: page 6, line 5; internet file system), forwarding the file system request to a network access application program (NAAP) communicatively (RAO: page 4, lines 20 – page 5, line 5; shared library) coupled to the operating system extension, the NAAP creating an HTTP/WebDAV formatted request in response to the file system request (RAO: page 8, lines 4-7; 11-13);

forwarding the HTTP/WebDAV formatted request to an appropriate WebDAV enabled HTTP server over the Internet (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; connects to the remote server);

receiving a response from the WebDAV enabled HTTP server in WebDAV or HTTP format such that the NAAP creates a reformatted response (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; obtains the specified file); and

transferring the reformatted response to the application program via the API as an ordinary file system response (RAO: page 9, lines 10-11; storing the file in cache of the operating system kernel).

Regarding claim 24, (Original) the machine readable medium of Claim 23 wherein receiving a file system request comprises:

obtaining at least a uniform resource locator (URL) and a request type (RAO: page 11, lines 17-20; page 13, Table 1; page 13, lines 16-21; open, close).

Regarding claim 25, (Original) the machine readable medium of Claim 24 wherein receiving a response comprises:

if a corresponding local cache file exists, updating the corresponding local cache file responsive to an information extracted from the response (RAO: page 8, lines 18-19; Figure 5);
and

if the corresponding local cache file does not exist, creating the corresponding local cache file to store the information extracted from the response (RAO: page 8, lines 18-19; Figure 5).

Regarding claim 26, (Original) the machine readable medium of Claim 25 wherein transferring comprises:

passing a file handle to the corresponding local cache file or at least a portion of the information (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; specified file; page 13, table 1, IFS Pathname).

Regarding claim 27, (Original) the machine readable medium of Claim 23 wherein the instructions executed by the processor cause the system to perform operations further comprising: if the file system request involves a locally cached remote file system, (RAO: page 18, lines 2-7) obtaining information responsive to the file system request from a local cache file (RAO: page 18, lines 8-11).

Regarding claim 28, (Original) the machine readable medium of Claim 27 wherein receiving the file system request comprises:

extracting a file handle to the locally cached remote file system from the file system request (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; specified file; page 13, table 1, IFS Pathname).

Regarding claim 29, (Currently Amended) the machine readable medium of Claim 27 wherein forwarding the request to a the NAAP, forwarding the HTTP/WebDAV formatted request, and receiving a response are bypassed when the file system request involves the locally cached remote file system (RAO: Figure 5).

Regarding claim 30, (Currently Amended) a machine readable medium having stored thereon instructions which when executed by a processor (RAO: Figure 1, computer) cause the machine to perform operations comprising:

- receiving a file system request (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) involving a remote file system (RAO: page 6, line 5; internet file sys) from an operating system extension (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; logical layer between operating system and applications), the operating system extension receiving the file system request (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) as an ordinary file system request from an application (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; logical layer between os and applications) unaware of a hypertext transfer protocol or distributed authoring and versioning (HTTP/WebDAV) protocol (RAO: page 6, lines 7; transparently);

- creating an HTTP/WebDAV formatted request in response to the file system request (RAO: page 8, lines 4-7; 11-13);

- forwarding the HTTP/WebDAV formatted request to an appropriate WebDAV enabled HTTP server (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; connects to the remote server);

- receiving a response from the WebDAV enabled HTTP server (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; obtains the specified file); and

- transferring an information contained in the response to the operating system extension (RAO: page 9, lines 10-11; storing the file in cache of the operating system kernel), wherein the information is presented as an ordinary file system response to the HTTP/WebDAV unaware application (RAO: page 6, lines 7; transparently; page 9, lines 10-11).

31. (Canceled)

Regarding claim 32, (Original) the machine readable medium of Claim 30 wherein receiving a file system request comprises:

obtaining at least a uniform resource identifier (URI) and a request type (RAO: page 11, lines 17-20; page 13, Table 1; page 13, lines 16-21; open, close).

Regarding claim 33, (Original) the machine readable medium of Claim 32 wherein creating comprises:

selecting an appropriate WebDAV/HTTP method responsive to the request type (RAO: page 8, lines 11-13; appropriate access protocol).

Regarding claim 34, (Original) the machine readable medium of Claim 30 wherein the instructions executed by the processor cause the system to perform operations further comprising:

extracting an information from the response (RAO: page 17, lines 20- page 18, line 7; Figure 5).

Regarding claim 35, (Original) the machine readable medium of Claim 30 wherein extracting comprises:

converting a WebDAV/HTTP status code to a corresponding local operating system error code (RAO: page 16, lines 20- page 17, line 7; Figure 5; codes illustrated as 0, -1 to indicate validity of resource).

Regarding claim 36, (Original) the machine readable medium of Claim 34 wherein the instructions executed by the processor cause the system to perform operations further comprising: creating a local cache file to store at least the information (RAO: page 8, lines 18-19; Figure 5).

Regarding claim 37, (Original) the machine readable medium of Claim 36 wherein transferring comprises:

passing a file handle to the local cache file or at least a portion of the information (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; specified file; page 13, table 1, IFS Pathname).

Regarding claim 38, (Original) the machine readable medium of Claim 34 wherein the instructions executed by the processor cause the system to perform operations further comprising:

updating a local cache file responsive to the information (RAO: page 8, lines 18-19).

Regarding claim 39, (Original) a computer system (RAO: Figure 1, tag 10) comprising:

at least one application program (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; applications);

an operating system providing a file system interface (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; logical layer, operating system);

an operating system extension (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; logical layer) to receive from the file system interface of the operating system a request for a remotely stored file (RAO: page 6, line 5, internet file system) that initiated from the application program (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; logical layer between operating system and applications) and to forward the request for the remotely stored file (RAO: page 4, line 20; shared library);

a network access application (RAO: page 4, line 20; shared library) program to receive the request for the remotely stored file from the operating system extension (RAO: page 20-24), to translate a file name information specified in the request from a local file system syntax to a remote server syntax (RAO: page 11, line 17 - page 13, table 1), and to package the request according to a well known protocol for communication to a user specified remote computer system over a network (RAO: page 7, line 3-7).

Regarding claim 40, (Original) the computer system of Claim 39 wherein the network access application program reformats a response received from the user specified remote computer system (RAO: page 11, line 17 - page 13, table 1), including reverse translating any file name information from a remote server syntax to a local file system syntax (RAO: page 13, table 1), and forwards a reformatted response to the operating system extension program (RAO: page 9, lines 10-11; storing the file in cache of the operating system kernel).

Regarding claim 41, (Original) the computer system of Claim 40 wherein the remote server syntax is the syntax of a uniform resource identifier (URI) (RAO: page 11, lines 17-20; page 13,

Table 1; page 13, lines 16-21; open, close).

Regarding claim 42, (Currently Amended) a method comprising:

receiving, at a file system of an operating system (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; operating system), a file system request (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) from an application program (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; applications);

if the file system request involves a remote file system on a remote computer system (RAO: page 6, lines 5-8; internet file system, remote server), forwarding from the file system of the operating system the request (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) to a network access application program (RAO: page 4, line 20; shared library) which translates a file name information specified in the request from a local file system syntax to a remote server syntax and communicates the request in a well known format to the remote computer system over a wide area network (RAO: page 11, line17 - page 13, table 1);

reformatting a response from the remote computer system forwarded by the remote access application program which reverse translates any file name information specified in the response from the remote server syntax to the local file system syntax; and transferring the reformatted response to the application program (RAO: page 8, lines 12-13; connects to the remote server; page 11, line17 - page 13, table 1).

Regarding claim 43, (Original) the method of Claim 42 wherein receiving comprises:

obtaining the file system request (RAO: page 7, lines 15-17) via a local file system interface of an operating system (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; logical layer between operating system and applications).

Regarding claim 44, (Original) the method of Claim 42 wherein the remote server syntax is the syntax of a uniform resource identifier (URI) (RAO: page 11, lines 17-20; page 13, Table 1; page 13, lines 16-21; open, close).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious.

The RAO reference teaches a system wherein the operating system extension and the network access application program communicate with each other (RAO: page 6, lines 8-13; logical layer between operating system and applications; access server; Figure 1).

The RAO reference does not explicitly state the use of sockets.

The RAO reference does teach the use of a naming scheme to establish connection (RAO: page 8, line 11-13; connects to the server; using protocols, hosts, and ports page 11, lines 17- page 12)

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system wherein the operating system extension and the network access application program communicate with each other as taught by RAO while using sockets in association with access protocols, hosts, and ports to establish a connection (RAO: page 8, line 11-13; connects to the server).

The Applicant Argues:

The rejection of the first office action should have been a 102(e) as associating the previously cited art's filing data. This is correct. The examiner amends his rejection with better art and an earlier date. Applicant is encouraged next time to submit a 131 affidavit with the amendment.

The rest of the applicants arguments are addressed in the newly cited art found in the information disclosure.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

brb
February 20, 2004


FRANTZ B. JEAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER